

OPINION 2328 (Case 3571)***Crotalinus catenatus* Rafinesque, 1818 (currently *Sistrurus catenatus*) and *Crotalus tergeminus* Say in James, 1822 (currently *Sistrurus tergeminus*; Reptilia, Serpentes): usage conserved by designation of neotypes for both species**

Abstract. The Commission has conserved the usage of the specific names *Crotalinus catenatus* Rafinesque, 1818 (currently *Sistrurus catenatus*) and *Crotalus tergeminus* Say in James, 1822 (currently *Sistrurus tergeminus* or *Sistrurus catenatus tergeminus*) for two species of pygmy rattlesnake, by designation of neotypes.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Reptilia; Serpentes; *Sistrurus*; *Sistrurus catenatus*; *Sistrurus tergeminus*; rattlesnakes; North America.

-
- (1) Under the plenary power specimen USNM 526 at the National Museum of Natural History, U.S.A. from Poland, Mahoning County, Ohio, U.S.A. is hereby designated as the neotype of *Crotalinus catenatus* Rafinesque, 1818.
 - (2) Under the specific powers specimen USNM 86472 at the National Museum of Natural History, U.S.A., from Winfield, Cowley, Kansas, U.S.A. is hereby designated as the neotype of *Crotalus tergeminus* Say in James, 1822.
 - (3) The name *catenatus* Rafinesque, 1811, as published in the binomen *Crotalinus catenatus*, and as defined by the neotype designated in (1) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
 - (4) The name *tergeminus* Say in James, 1822, as published in the binomen *Crotalus tergeminus* and as defined by the neotype designated in (1) above is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology

History of Case 3571

An application to conserve the long established usage of the specific names *Crotalinus catenatus* Rafinesque, 1818 (currently *Sistrurus catenatus*) and *Crotalus tergeminus* Say in James, 1822 (currently *Sistrurus tergeminus* or *Sistrurus catenatus tergeminus*) for two species of pygmy rattlesnake was received from B.I. Crother (*Southeastern Louisiana University, Hammond, LA, U.S.A.*), J.M. Savage (*San Diego State University, San Diego, CA, U.S.A.*) and A.T. Holycross (*Mesa Community College, Mesa, & School of Life Sciences, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, U.S.A.*) on 10 August 2011. After correspondence, the case was published in BZN **68**: 271–274. The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. One comment by the original authors proposing a new specimen to be designated as the neotype of *Crotalus tergeminus* Say in James, 1822 was published in BZN **69**(1): 62–63.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 June 2013 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals modified from those published in BZN (**68**: 273). At the close of the voting period on 1 September 2013 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 22: Alonso-Zarazaga, Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Brothers, Fautin, Grygier, Halliday, Harvey, Kojima, Kottelat, Krell, Kullander, Lamas, Lim, Minelli, Pape, Rosenberg, Štys, van Tol, Winston, Yanega and Zhou.

Negative votes – 1: Zhang.

Abstained – 1: Bouchet.

Ng, Patterson and Pyle were on leave of absence.

ABSTAINING, Bouchet commented that he approved the intention of the application, but regretted that the neotypes chosen were not linked to any molecular data. The neotypes might or might not be of suitable preservation for DNA extraction and sequencing. It was, in his opinion, highly anachronistic to fix in the year 2013 neotypes that were not associated with molecular data, especially for species from North America where they could easily be collected. He did not vote 'Against' the proposals because he did not want to give the impression that he disapproved of the intention of the application; but he did not vote 'For' the neotypes proposed to the Commission. Voting FOR, Harvey said that he was in favour of the proposal, including the modification proposed in BZN 69: 63. In the original application proposal (1) mistakenly stated 'Rafinesque, 1816' instead of 'Rafinesque, 1818'. Also Voting FOR, Rosenberg said that the application should have provided a statement of characters regarded as differentiating the taxa for which the neotypes were designated.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

catenatus, *Crotalinus*, Rafinesque, 1818, *American Monthly Magazine and Critical Review*, 4: 41.

tergeminus, *Crotalus*, Say in James, 1822, *Account of an expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains, performed in the years 1819 and '20, by order of the Hon. J. C. Calhoun, Sec'y of War: under the command of Major Stephen H. Long. From the notes of Major Long, Mr. T. Say, and other gentlemen of the exploring party*, vol. 1. H.C. Carey & I. Lea, Philadelphia, p. 499.